

SUBJECT: Presolicitation Notice No. DACA87-NMD-0001, National Missile Defense Tactical and Tactical Support Facilities

## **CONTENTS**

### **1.0 CONTRACT BACKGROUND**

#### **1.1 Scope**

#### **1.2 Special Requirements, Estimated Contract Duration, Limits and Amounts**

#### **1.3 Project Performance Capabilities**

### **2.0 PREQUALIFICATION PROCESS**

#### **2.1 Phase One: Prequalification**

#### **2.2 Phase Two: Contract Proposals**

### **3.0 PREQUALIFICATION EVALUATION FACTORS**

### **4.0 PREQUALIFICATION WRITTEN SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS**

#### **4.1 Format**

#### **4.2 Organization of Submittal**

#### **4.3 Procedure**

### **5.0 PREQUALIFICATION EVALUATION FACTORS FOR WRITTEN SUBMITTAL ITEMS**

#### **5.1 Past Performance**

#### **5.2 Experience of Offerors**

#### **5.3 Technical Approach**

#### **5.4 Teaming Arrangements**

#### **5.5 Quality Control/Assurance**

## **PAPERLESS PUBLICATION NOTICE**

**[Http://www.hnd.usace.army.mil](http://www.hnd.usace.army.mil)**

Any subsequent revisions to this notice will be reflected on this web page. The Government will not, as a matter of routine, mail, fax, or e-mail this Presolicitation Notice. Offerors are responsible for checking this web page early and periodically for any updates to this document. This Government web site is occasionally inaccessible due to maintenance. The Government is not responsible for any loss of Internet connectivity or for any offeror's inability to access or download this document. Questions should be addressed to:

**[Wanda.H.Hampton@hnd01.usace.army.mil](mailto:Wanda.H.Hampton@hnd01.usace.army.mil)**

## **1.0 CONTRACT BACKGROUND**

### **1.1 Scope**

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Huntsville Center, is seeking sources to construct tactical and tactical support facilities in support of the National Missile Defense Program (NMD). This effort will be accomplished under a cost plus award fee-type contract. The Ballistic Missile Defense Organization (BMDO) has developed a National Missile Defense strategy for developing and deploying a ground-based missile defense system designed to protect the United States against limited ballistic missile attacks. Development of the weapon systems and design of the deployment systems is now under way. There are multiple sites under consideration for deployment staging. The weapon system element may be located at Clear Air Station, Alaska; Fort Greely, Alaska; or Grand Forks Air Force Base, North Dakota. The X-Band radar complex may be located at two possible sites in North Dakota or in Shemya, Alaska. The Government's objective is to partner with firms representing the best value to the Government. The Government seeks to maximize the probability of success on the critical projects by partnering with experienced, reliable, and innovative contractor teams demonstrating key management and integration success factors.

### **1.2 Special Requirements, Estimated Contract Duration, Limits and Amounts**

The value of the contract is estimated to be over \$500 Million. Contract award is dependent upon congressional approval of the NMD program. Assuming the program is approved, contract award is expected between summer of 2000 and end of year 2001. Duration is expected to be through the year 2003-2004 time frame. The Standard Industrial Classification Code is 1542 and the solicitation is unrestricted. Offerors should select their teams with the following goals in mind: 61.2% of the work subcontracted should be Small Businesses including 9.1% Small Disadvantaged Businesses, 4.5 % Women Owned Businesses, and 1% HUBZone Businesses. The offeror's Corporate Small Business Program Manager should be prepared to execute the solicitation's subcontracting plan. A concern is considered a small business if its annual average gross revenue taken over the last three fiscal years does not exceed \$17 Million.

### **1.3 Project Performance Capabilities**

Prequalification of offerors is necessary to obtain enhanced performance capabilities, encourage teaming and ensure that only highly qualified offerors participate in the proposal phase of the acquisition. Work performed under this contract will be for tactical and tactical support facility construction. The offeror must have proven high-dollar, schedule sensitive management experience. The offeror's work should be similar in nature, magnitude, and complexity to the NMD project to include, construction of missile launch, below ground structures, physical/electronic security, radar, and various support facilities. High-Altitude Electromagnetic Pulse (HEMP), and radio frequency interference/electromagnetic interference (RFI/EMI) shielding experience with high-reliability utility systems is also important. Experience in obtaining permits to satisfy environmental laws and regulations is required. Cold region construction experience is critical to the offeror's performance capability. Contract performance will require access to information classified as SECRET. The offeror and all personnel needing to access classified or program sensitive data related to this program must be able to obtain SECRET clearance.

## 2.0 PREQUALIFICATION PROCESS

This procurement will be conducted in two phases in accordance with procedures outlined in Federal Acquisition Regulations (FAR) Part 9 and 15. In **Phase One (prequalification)**, submittals will be evaluated to determine which offerors will be invited to submit **Phase II** proposals for construction of facilities.

### 2.1 Phase One: Prequalification

Prospective offerors will be prequalified to ensure that offerors competing for the contract can successfully construct a wide range of complex facilities across a multi-state area. This Phase One evaluation process will consist of two steps: (1) evaluation of written submittal of qualifications, and (2) oral presentations by the most highly qualified offerors.

#### 2.1.1 Step One – Written Submittals

Prospective offerors must first submit demonstrated qualifications and experience as described in this Prequalification Notice. Submittals will be considered relative to the prequalification evaluation factors and points scored by a Government evaluation team. (The submittal procedures for this step are further described in paragraph 4.3). The Contracting Officer will make an initial determination based on submitted qualifications.

#### 2.1.2 Step Two – Oral Presentations

The Contracting Officer will then arrange for in-person oral presentations by the most highly qualified offerors from the initial evaluation of written submittals. Currently presentations will take place the week of 15-19 November 1999, with the presentation order determined by lot. We expect that offerors will be notified of the date and time of their presentation on or about 4 November 1999. Presentations will be conducted at the Corps of Engineers office in Huntsville, Alabama. The Contracting Officer will make the final competitive range determination based on the oral presentations.

Offerors will be notified via letter of results of the prequalification phase of this procurement. Offerors who are not selected to submit proposals may request debriefing by submitting a written request to the Contracting Officer within three days after receipt of the notice of exclusion from the list of prequalified offerors.

### 2.2 Phase Two: Contract Proposals

A focus industry briefing with the qualified offerors will be held prior to issuance of the final RFP. A draft RFP will be issued prior to the focus industry briefing for comments.

The final RFP is scheduled for release in early 2000, with approximately 45 calendar days allowed to prepare proposals based on prior information and draft RFP information available.

## 3.0 PREQUALIFICATION EVALUATION FACTORS

Phase One (Step 1) written submittals will be evaluated using the following five major factors, listed in order of importance as follows:

Past Performance  
Experience of Offerors  
Technical Approach  
Teaming Arrangements  
Quality Control/Assurance

Phase One (Step 2) oral presentations will be evaluated in accordance with factors contained in the invitation letter.

#### **4.0 PREQUALIFICATION WRITTEN SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS**

##### **4.1 Format**

Submittals should be on 8 1/2 x 11-inch paper, to the maximum extent practicable, and must be submitted in standard letter (8 1/2 x 11-inch) hardback loose-leaf ring binders. Typing font shall be 10 pt. minimum. Contents of binders shall be tabbed and labeled to afford easy identification from the submittal Table of Contents. No material shall be incorporated by reference. Any such material will not be considered for evaluation. Each document shall be presented in a manner that allows it to stand alone without need for evaluators to reference other documents.

Submittals are not to exceed 50 pages. All pages must be numbered sequentially from the beginning to the end of the proposal document. Do not restart the page numbering sequence at tabs or any other internal division. All photographs should include descriptive captions. Photographs (which are defined broadly to include renderings and other graphic representation) should be designated sequentially from the beginning to end of the proposal document. Use of a separate "List of Photos" cross-reference page is discouraged. Photographs will not be considered a page. A photograph with text in excess of a two-line caption, however, is counted as one page. Doublesided pages count as two pages. Pages beyond the 50<sup>th</sup> page may be discarded. Unnecessarily elaborate brochures or other presentation materials beyond those sufficient to present a complete and effective response are not desired.

##### **4.2 Organization of Submittal**

Submittals should be organized as follows, with tabs marking each of the sections shown in *Italics*:

*Table of Contents*

*Information Page* [company name, addresses, telephone numbers, fax numbers, e-mail addresses, and points of contact for each firm proposed for the team].

*Past Performance*

*Experience of Offerors*

*Technical Approach*

*Teaming Arrangements*

*Quality Control/Assurance*

#### 4.3 Procedure

**Offerors must submit information in all of the evaluated areas in sufficient detail to permit proper evaluation.** Absence of information will be deemed as if no support for the item or data exists. The burden for providing up-to-date point of contact and other information rests with the offeror. The Government will not seek out correction to incomplete or insufficient information on your behalf. Unverifiable information will not be considered. Electronic copies to the e-mail listed below will also be accepted

Submit original and seven (7) copies of information to:

U.S. Army, Corps of Engineers  
CEHNC-CT-E (ATTN: W. Hampton)  
P.O. Box 1600  
Huntsville, Alabama 35807-4301

Street Delivery Address:  
4820 University Square  
Huntsville, Alabama 35816-1822

**If your firm/team is interested in being included in the competition for prequalification for this project, please provide your submittal data, as specified in this document, to the above address no later than 3:00 p.m. Central Daylight Time on Friday 21October 1999.**

If you have any questions on these submittal requirements, contact Wanda Hampton via e-mail to: [Wanda.H.Hampton@hnd01.usace.army.mil](mailto:Wanda.H.Hampton@hnd01.usace.army.mil). The telephone number is (256) 895-1168 and the facsimile number (256) 895-1378.

### **5.0 PREQUALIFICATION EVALUATION FACTORS FOR WRITTEN SUBMITTAL ITEMS**

#### 5.1 Past Performance

##### 5.1.1 Evaluation

The Government will evaluate the relative merits of each offeror's past performance to assess performance risk for this project. The Government reserves the right to consider all aspects of an offeror's performance history, but will attribute significance to work that is similar in nature, magnitude, and complexity to the NMD project. Assessment of past performance will include quality of work, demonstrated ability to meet contract schedules and major program milestones, demonstrated knowledge of cost reimbursable contracting principles including offeror's history of actual costs being within reasonable range of negotiated baseline, positive trends in award fees earned over time on cost type contracts, communication, management excellence, team continuity, corporate oversight and commitment, customer satisfaction (as evidenced by client satisfaction survey), history of environmental compliance, and financial condition of the offeror. Satisfaction surveys completed by the offeror's clients will be evaluated. Government databases will be checked and previous clients may be contacted as references.

##### 5.1.2 Submittal:

- 5.1.2.1 The offeror shall describe its successful past performance on projects of similar size, scope, and complexity as the NMD project. The offeror should discuss how technical competencies and unique abilities obtained by past experience on similar projects will be translated into reduced risk on this project. Examples should include technical approaches used to reduce risk when transitioning between phases of a project; experience in developing and utilizing computerized management control systems; approaches or techniques used to bring about continuous quality improvement; creative and unique technical problem resolution approaches used to mitigate impacts of programmatic technical problems; experience responding in a timely manner and effective manner to change orders. The offeror shall describe its organization and management experience, how that experience is relevant to this project, and how unique project risk management aspects associated with previous contracts will be transported to this project. The offeror should address successful past experience involving organizational compositions similar to the one proposed for this contract. The offeror should identify those contracts where the team members and/or subcontractors have worked together in the past.
- 5.1.2.2 Letters of Recognition, Appreciation or Awards. The offeror may provide letters of recognition/appreciation/award received from previous clients on the projects identified in the Experience section of the submittal.
- 5.1.2.3 Provide the attached survey forms directly to the clients you desire to use as references. To be considered, the client satisfaction forms must be completed by the client and mailed by the client directly to the Contracting Officer to arrive by 3:00 p.m. Central Daylight Time, October 14, 1999. Client satisfaction surveys submitted directly by the offeror will not be considered. No more than two client satisfaction survey forms per project submitted will be evaluated. Provide the name, phone number, and e-mail address of each individual you have requested to complete a Client Satisfaction Survey.
- 5.1.2.4 The offeror shall provide their audited Income Statements and Balance Sheets for the past three fiscal years. This information is also required for proposed team or joint venture members and all currently identified subcontractors. This information may be verified by the Government through reviews of the Dun & Bradstreet Reports.
- 5.1.2.5 Corporate Oversight and Commitment The offeror should provide examples where Corporate Oversight Boards have been used successfully to resolve problems or issues, which jeopardized a project's major milestones or objectives. The extent to which corporate resources, outside those specifically assigned to the project, were drawn upon to resolve programmatic problems or issues should also be addressed. The offeror shall submit statements signed by officers in the corporate management of its organization indicating the level of attention and commitment which they will give to this project.
- 5.1.2.6 Corporate Environmental Compliance Experience. The offeror shall address experience with obtaining and modifying environmental permits, and provide a general assessment of their corporate relationship with Federal, and State

Regulatory Agencies. The offeror shall identify all citations, including criminal penalties, civil penalties, and/or consent orders/agreements received on any projects from the Environmental Protection Agency or state environmental regulatory agencies.

5.1.2.7 Cost Reimbursable Contract Experience: For cost reimbursable contracts listed in the experience submittal, the offeror should provide a line chart reflecting the negotiated cost baseline compared to the actual costs incurred for the past four years. If actual costs for the current year are not available, provide the projected cost estimate. The offeror shall address any causes for overruns over five percent of the negotiated baseline and efforts taken to control costs and reduce the risk and magnitude of future overruns. For each cost plus award fee contract submitted in the Experience section, provide a line chart reflecting the percentage earned (Y-axis) of the award fee pool available for each award fee rating period (X-axis) over the past four years. The offeror should address causes for negative trends or causes for earning less than 75% of the available pool amount during any rating period. The Government will carefully review trends and demonstrated ability to avoid recurring negative findings.

5.1.2.8 The offeror shall provide a summary of their project completion records indicating; 1) whether any contract has been terminated (in whole or in part) for default; 2) whether any awarded work has failed to be completed and reasons why; and 3) whether any liquidated or actual damages have been assessed for failure to meet contractual completion dates. The offeror shall identify and address the causes and outcome of any "Show Cause" letter or "Cure Notice" issued by a Contracting Officer for the offeror's failure to satisfy technical requirements of the contract; 4) time required after NTP for client approval of the initial NAS.

## 5.2 Experience of Offerors

### 5.2.1 Evaluation

The offeror shall describe its experience addressing the following three factors:

#### 5.2.1.1 Construction Management

#### 5.2.1.2 Construction Experience

#### 5.2.1.3 Managing Cost Reimbursable Contracts

### 5.2.2 Submittal

Describe relevant experience on projects similar in complexity and/or size to the NMD project successfully completed within the last 5 years by the offeror and/or its proposed team. Submit an experience data summary for each project with the following information.

NAME OF OFFEROR:

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT EXPERIENCE:

PROJECT NAME:

PROJECT LOCATION:

DOLLAR VALUE OF CONSTRUCTION

TYPE OF CONTRACT (e.g., FFP, CPAF, etc):

DATES OF CONSTRUCTION:

SPECIFIC DUTIES/FUNCTIONS ON THE PROJECT (E.G., PRIME CONTRACTOR, SUBCONTRACTOR, ETC.)

NATURE OF THE PROJECT

DESCRIBE THE WORK YOUR COMPANY PERFORMED:

EXTENT AND TYPE OF WORK CONTRACTED OUT:

CLIENT POINT OF CONTACT:

NAME:

ADDRESS:

PHONE NUMBER:

FAX NUMBER:

E-MAIL ADDRESS:

### 5.3 Technical Approach

#### 5.3.1 Evaluation

This part will be used to evaluate the offeror's project execution capability and plan. It is expected that the offeror will adapt its standard practices for this work. Therefore, the submittals shall emphasize the offeror's standard approaches and procedures for the following factors:

##### 5.3.1.1 Project Management Execution Plan

##### 5.3.1.2 Management Approach and Procedures

##### 5.3.1.3 Logistics to Remote Locations

##### 5.3.1.4 Subcontract Management

#### 5.3.2 Submittal

5.3.2.1 Project Management Execution Plan: The offeror shall describe how it expects to use its resources and experience to execute this project. The description shall include a narrative outlining how the offeror's management technique offers advantages for this project. It shall also discuss anticipated problems in execution and how the offeror expects to overcome them. The offeror shall also discuss how he will address the execution of the various options. The offeror should summarize the proposed team composition and briefly describe important aspects of the offeror's proposed organizational composition and/or experience that the Government should consider in its assessment of performance risk.



5.3.2.2 Management Approach and Procedures: The offeror shall discuss its standard management approaches and methods and techniques which it uses to manage and control work. The offeror shall describe how it manages the execution and completion of work to include, construction, configuration control/management testing, submission of technical documents reflecting as-built condition, operation and maintenance manuals and personnel training. Where appropriate, the offeror shall provide a table of contents of existing procedures. The offeror shall describe the manner in which actual work accomplished versus scheduled work is measured. It shall also discuss and demonstrate ability to work under time-restricted schedules and to meet critical interim and final completion dates. Finally, the offeror shall discuss the effectiveness of his approaches and procedures on projects of similar size and complexity.

5.3.2.3 Logistics for Remote Locations: The offeror shall discuss its standard logistic approaches for remote locations and describe how it will provide personnel, equipment, and materials for remote locations.

5.3.2.4 Subcontract Management: The offeror shall discuss its subcontract management procedures, and controls relative to schedule, cost and quality.

#### 5.4 Teaming Arrangements

##### 5.4.1 Evaluation

Teaming arrangements include joint ventures, partnerships and major subcontractors. The degree to which firms in the team have worked together on similar projects will be evaluated. Firms with no experience teaming with other firms in the proposed team will receive zero points for this evaluation factor. A history of highly successful teaming between the prime construction contractor and the offered lead firm(s) is important. Both the duration and extent of prior teaming will be evaluated.

It is expected that the team presented in Phase One will be essentially the same as the team proposed in Phase Two.

##### 5.4.2 Submittal

5.4.2.1 Team Summary Matrix: Submit a Team Summary Matrix to reflect similar projects where the firms have worked together. The matrix should show all firms on one axis and the project title/date on the other axis. In each matrix block, show the specific duties performed by that firm on that project. If the firm did not work on that project, the matrix block should be left blank.

5.4.2.2 Project Teaming Summaries & Statements: For each listed project describe the experience of the team working together on similar projects. Start with the most recent projects and work backwards in time for the past five years. Each of the summaries should include a captioned photograph of the project. For each project, specify whether the teaming experience is for the firm or for an individual. The description should include a discussion of how long the team or key members of the team have worked together, as well as how many projects the team has

performed together. Do not assume that the Government understands and can trace the changing relationships between individuals and firms unless explicitly stated.

Project title and location:		
Dollar value of Construction (Please Specify)	Construction Period (month/year start to month/year end)	State any award or recognition received
Brief description of salient characteristics of project:		
Names of firms (or individuals that participated in each project. Describe the work and give the percentage of work performed. (For individuals, describe the specific project role).		
Client Point of Contact (Name, address, current phone number, including fax number and e-mail address)		

## 5.5 Quality Control/Assurance

### 5.5.1 Evaluation

Quality procedures involve those of the offeror, its subcontractors and sub-subcontractors, etc. The requirement is to present a total quality effort which runs from the top Contractor through the lowest level of performance. The degree to which this integration can be shown to have occurred in the past and can be projected with this project will be evaluated.

### 5.5.2 Submittal

#### 5.5.2.1 Role of QC in Organization

#### 5.5.2.2 Current QA/QC plan requirements (training, elements and their relationships, management responsibilities, etc.)

#### 5.5.2.3 QA/QC plan for subcontractors

#### 5.5.2.4 Experience with Army Corps of Engineers' construction quality procedures.

#### 5.5.2.5 Any pertinent certification (MIL-Q, ISO, etc.) of organization

**CUSTOMER SATISFACTION SURVEY ( PAGE 1 OF 4)**  
**DACA87-NMD-0001**

NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE TACTICAL AND TACTICAL SUPPORT FACILITIES

**SECTION 1 – TO BE COMPLETED BY THE OFFEROR AND PROVIDED TO THE  
CLIENT REFERENCE**

*Offeror Name:*

---

**Project Title, Location, and Dates:**

---

**Project Manager:**

---

---

**SECTION 2 – TO BE COMPLETED BY THE CLIENT REFERENCE AND MAILED OR  
FAXED DIRECTLY TO:**

**U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS  
ATTN: CT-E (WANDA HAMPTON)  
4820 UNIVERSITY SQUARE  
HUNTSVILLE, AL 35816-1822**

**FAX NUMBER : 256-895-1752**

To References: The offeror shown above has submitted a prequalification package on a Corps of Engineers project. Part of the evaluation of that proposal requires evaluation of that offeror's past performance. That offeror has provided your name as a client reference. Your input is important to us in evaluating that offeror's past performance. The purpose of this form is to assess the customer satisfaction of that offeror based on the work performed on your project. Responses are requested by October 14, 1999. Your assistance in evaluating the offeror's past performance is greatly appreciate.

In the blocks below, please indicate your overall level of satisfaction with the work performed by the offeror shown in Section 1. Mark *Not Applicable* (N/A) for any areas that do not apply. Please include comments on page 3 of this form.

**RATING CATEGORIES : 1-UNSATISFACTORY; 2-MARGINAL; 3-FAIR; 4-GOOD; 5-EXCELLENT; N/A - AREAS THAT DO NOT APPLY**

<b>1</b>	<b>PROJECT MANAGEMENT ASSESSMENT</b>						
A	Your assessment of the quality of the offeror's performance.	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
B	Offeror's compliance with contract requirements and established procedures and protocols.	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
C	Was the contract performed in a safe and environmentally responsible manner.	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
D	Ability of the offeror to hire and retain qualified personnel and to provide continuous training to maintain critical skills.	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
E	Overall effectiveness of the safety, environmental, and quality assurance/control programs.	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
F	Contractor/Client relations during contract performance.	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
G	Would you recommend the award of similar contract in the future?      Yes : _____      No : _____ Please explain:	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
<b>2</b>	<b>TIMELINESS OF PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT</b>						
A	The effectiveness of the offeror's ability to meet milestones used to meet performance.	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
B	Offeror's responsiveness to technical direction.	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
C	Offeror's provision of O&M documentation, training and support	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
D	Was the contract completed on time?	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
<b>3</b>	<b>COST CONTROL</b>						
A	Effectiveness of the cost and schedule control system.	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
B	Was the relationship of negotiated costs to actuals realistic?	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
C	Was payment withheld or liquidated damages assessed? (If yes, please describe below)	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
D	Did the offeror control cost overruns?	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
E	Were billings current, accurate, and complete?	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
F	Ability to mitigate cost growth in new work or changes.	1	2	3	4	5	N/A

<b>4</b>	<b>BUSINESS PRACTICES AND RELATIONS</b>						
A	The effectiveness of contractor recommended solutions.	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
B	Managed subcontractors effectively.	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
C	Prompt notification of problems impacting performance.	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
D	Effectiveness of response to technical and administrative issues.	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
E	Was effective management and corporate oversight demonstrated?	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
<b>5</b>	<b>ADDITIONAL RELEVANT DATA</b>						
A	Has the offeror been issued any type of performance warning such as a cure notice or a show cause letter? Have they been terminated for default by your organization or another organization that you are aware of?	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
B	If an award fee was used in this contract, what was the trend of the earned award fee? Upward _____ Downward _____ Stable _____	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
C	Were any features offered in the proposal not included in the completed project? (If yes, please describe below)	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
D	Was the team offered in the proposal the same team that worked on the project? (If no, please describe below)	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
E	Kept you informed.	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
F	Your overall level of customer satisfaction.	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
<b>6</b>	<b>REMARKS</b>						
A	Discuss strengths and weakness of the offeror.						

B

Other comments:

Your Name:

Firm:

Phone Number:

Fax Number:

Relationship to this project: